IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION

ALDERAY Q. SIMMONDS, Inmate No. 1234041

Plaintiff,

v. 1:13-cv-2360-WSD

UNKNOWN DEFENDANT,

Defendant.

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Justin S. Anand's Final Report and Recommendation [2] ("R&R") recommending that this action be dismissed.

I. BACKGROUND

On July 15, 2013, Plaintiff Alderay Q. Simmonds ("Plaintiff"), then an inmate at the Fulton County Jail, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action alleging civil rights abuses. At the time that this case was filed, Plaintiff had another civil rights action pending in the Court. See Simmonds v. Unknown, Civil Action No. 1:13-cv-170-WSD. In Plaintiff's other case, the Court encountered difficulties in mailing its Orders to Plaintiff at the Fulton County Jail (see Id., Doc. 6), and

learned that Plaintiff was released from the Fulton County Jail on August 29, 2013.

See http://justice.fultoncountyga.gov/PAJailManager/JailingDetail.aspx?

JailingID=343 (last visited November 6, 2013). Plaintiff has not provided the Court with his new address in either action.

On October 22, 2013, Magistrate Judge Anand issued his R&R. In it, the Magistrate Judge recommended that Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Local Rule 41.2(C) because Plaintiff failed to notify the Court of his current address, and as a result, the Court is unaware of "Plaintiff's whereabouts." (R&R at 2). No objection has been filed.

II. DISCUSSION

A. <u>Legal Standard</u>

After conducting a careful and complete review of the findings and recommendations, a district judge may accept, reject, or modify a magistrate judge's report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (Supp. V 2011); Williams v. Wainwright, 681 F.2d 732, 732 (11th Cir. 1982) (per curiam). A district judge "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If no party has objected to the report and recommendation, a court conducts only a plain error review of the record. United States v. Slay, 714

F.2d 1093, 1095 (11th Cir. 1983) (per curiam).

B. Analysis

As the Magistrate Judge noted in his October 22, 2013 R&R, the Court currently does not have any information about Plaintiff's address and does not have other contact information for him. Plaintiff's failure to provide the Court with accurate contact information has delayed and adversely affected the management of this case, including because these proceedings cannot continue without being able to communicate with Plaintiff.

Local Rule 41.2(C) provides that

[t]he failure . . . of a party appearing *pro se* to keep the clerk's office informed of any change in address and/or telephone number which causes a delay or otherwise adversely affects the management of the case shall constitute grounds . . . for dismissal of the action without prejudice.

The Court does not find plain error in the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations in his R&R that this action be dismissed without prejudice.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Justin S. Anand's Final Report and Recommendation [2] is **ADOPTED**, and this action is **DISMISSED**WITHOUT PREJUDICE pursuant to Local Rule 41.2(C).

SO ORDERED this 8th day of November, 2013.

WILLIAM S. DUFFEY, JR.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE